1 Roberta L. Steele, Regional Attorney 2 U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission 3 San Francisco District Office 450 Golden Gate Ave, 5th Floor West 4 P.O. Box 36025 5 San Francisco, CA 94102 6 Damien Lee, Supervisory Trial Attorney 7 U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Seattle Field Office 8 909 First Avenue, Suite 400 9 Seattle, WA 98104 TEL: (206) 576-3038 10 damien.lee@eeoc.gov 11 12 ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF 13 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 14 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 15 16 **EQUAL EMPLOYMENT** CIVIL ACTION NO. CV-OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION 17 18 Plaintiff, **COMPLAINT** 19 v. 20 21 MONSON FRUIT CO., LLC (f/k/a MONSON FRUIT CO., INC.) d/b/a JURY TRIAL DEMAND 22 "MONSON FRUIT CO.," 23 Defendant. 24 25

#### NATURE OF THE ACTION

This is an action under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended ("Title VII") and Title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 to correct unlawful employment practices on the basis of sex and to provide appropriate relief to Charging Party Brenda Sanchez Cossio ("Cossio") and Herbie Eduardo Rodriguez ("Rodriguez"). The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC" or "Commission") alleges that Defendant Monson Fruit Co., LLC (f/k/a Monson Fruit Co., Inc.) d/b/a "Monson Fruit Co." ("Defendant") subjected Cossio to a hostile work environment because of her sex, female, and retaliated against her for engaging in protected EEO activity, which resulted in her constructive discharge. The EEOC also alleges that Defendant terminated Cossio's spouse, Rodriguez, in retaliation for Cossio's protected EEO activity and for refusing her manager's sexual harassment, propositions and touching. Plaintiff EEOC seeks injunctive relief and monetary relief on behalf of Cossio and Rodriguez, including pecuniary damages, nonpecuniary compensatory damages, punitive damages, back pay, and prejudgment interest.

## JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 451, 1331, 1337, 1343 and 1345. This action is authorized and instituted pursuant to sections 706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended,

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

12 13

14

15 16

17

19

18

20 21

22

24

23 25

42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e-5(f)(1) and (3) ("Title VII"), and Section 102 of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, 42 U.S.C. § 1981a.

The employment practices alleged to be unlawful were committed 2. within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington.

#### **PARTIES**

- Plaintiff EEOC is the agency of the United States of America charged 3. with the administration, interpretation and enforcement of Title VII, and is expressly authorized to bring this action by Section 706(f)(1) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e-5(f)(1) and (3).
- 4. At all relevant times, Defendant has been a corporation continuously doing business in the State of Washington and has continuously had at least fifteen (15) employees.
- At all relevant times, Defendant has continuously been an employer 5. engaged in an industry affecting commerce within the meaning of Sections 701(b), (g) and (h) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e-(b), (g) and (h).

# ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

More than thirty (30) days prior to the institution of this lawsuit, 6. Charging Party Cossio filed a charge with the EEOC alleging violations of Title VII by Defendant.

- 7. On May 2, 2022, the Commission issued to Defendant a Letter of Determination as to the above charge finding reasonable cause to believe Title VII was violated and inviting Defendant to join with the Commission in informal methods of conciliation to endeavor to eliminate the unlawful employment practices and to provide appropriate relief.
- 8. The Commission engaged in communications with Defendant to provide Defendant the opportunity to remedy the discriminatory practices described in the letter of determination.
- 9. The Commission was unable to secure from Defendant a conciliation agreement acceptable to the Commission.
- 10. On July 26, 2022, the Commission issued to Defendant a Notice of Failure of Conciliation advising that the Commission was unable to secure from Defendant a conciliation agreement acceptable to the Commission.
- 11. All conditions precedent to the institution of this lawsuit have been fulfilled.

## STATEMENT OF CLAIMS

12. From at least June 2019 until September 2019, Defendant engaged in unlawful employment practices at its facilities in Selah, Washington in violation of § 703(a) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e-2(a) and 2000e-3. Defendant

engaged in these unlawful practices by subjecting Cossio to a hostile work environment based on sex and then subjecting her to retaliation and constructive discharge. Defendant also terminated Cossio's spouse Rodriguez in December 2019 in retaliation for Cossio's protected EEO activity.

- 13. The practices complained of in paragraph 12 include, but are not limited, to the following:
  - a. Defendant's employee, a male manager, subjected Charging Party

    Cossio to repeated, almost daily, inappropriate and unwanted sexual
    advances and sexual comments, including telling her: (1) she had a
    nice body; (2) he wanted to be with her since she first started working
    for Defendant; (3) he could give her money or a better position in
    exchange for sex; (4) she should leave her partner Rodriguez because
    she already had a child and he could easily fire Rodriguez from

    Defendant; (5) he wanted her as his birthday present; (6) he watched
    her through the video surveillance cameras, called her to tell her he
    was watching her, and asked her to move so he could see her better;
    and (7) to come into work when she was not needed just to
    proposition her.

- b. Cossio rebuffed the manager's repeated advances and reported his harassment to her supervisor. Yet the manager's harassing behavior continued.
- c. After Cossio transferred to another position to have less interaction with the harassing manager, he began to retaliate against Cossio for refusing his sexual advances and complaining about his harassment. The manager's retaliation included refusing to provide her with assistance that he ensured that other pregnant women received, including help lifting heavy boxes, and arranging for the termination of her spouse, Rodriguez (who had worked for Defendant continuously for two years), in December 2019.
- d. Defendant terminated Rodriguez because of his wife's engagement in protected activities and her rebuffing her manager's sexual harassment, propositions, and touching.
- e. Defendant failed to take prompt and effective remedial action to stop the male manager's sexual harassment of Cossio starting in 2019 when she first complained about his unwelcome behavior.
- f. The male manager's sexual harassment of Cossio resulted in conditions so intolerable that she was forced to constructively discharge following her maternity leave.

24

25

- 14. The effect of the practices complained of in paragraphs 12-13 above has been to deprive Cossio and Rodriguez of equal employment opportunities and otherwise adversely affected their status as employees.
- 15. The unlawful employment practices complained of in paragraphs 12-13 above were intentional.
- 16. The unlawful employment practices complained of in paragraphs 12-13 above were done with malice or with reckless indifference to the federally protected rights of Cossio and Rodriguez.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, the Commission respectfully requests that this Court:

- A. Grant a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant, its officers, successors, agents, assigns, and all persons in active concert or participation with it, from engaging in any employment practice that discriminates based on sex, female.
- B. Grant a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant, its officers, successors, agents, assigns, and all persons in active concert or participation with it, from engaging in any employment practice that constitutes retaliation.
- C. Order Defendant to institute and carry out policies, practices, and programs which provide equal employment opportunities for all employees regardless of sex, prevent sexual harassment, and protect all employees from

10

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

23

22

24

25

unlawful retaliation, and which eradicate the effects of its past and present unlawful employment practices.

- Order Defendant to make Cossio and Rodriguez whole by providing D. appropriate back pay with prejudgment interest, in amounts to be determined at trial, and other affirmative relief necessary to eradicate the effects of Defendant's unlawful employment practices described in paragraphs 12-13 above in amounts to be determined at trial.
- E. Order Defendant to make whole Cossio and Rodriguez by providing compensation for past and future pecuniary losses resulting from the unlawful employment practices described in paragraphs 12-13 above, including past and future out-of-pocket expenses, in amounts to be determined at trial.
- Order Defendant to make whole Cossio and Rodriguez by providing F. compensation for past and future nonpecuniary losses resulting from the unlawful practices complained of in paragraphs 12-13 above, including without limitation emotional pain, suffering, and loss of enjoyment of life, in amounts to be determined at trial.
- Order Defendant to pay Cossio and Rodriguez punitive damages for G. its malicious and reckless conduct described in paragraphs 12-13 above, in amounts to be determined at trial.

EEOC v. MONSON FRUIT CO.

Attorneys for Plaintiff

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this date, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system.

DATED this 30<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2022

/s/ Jimmy Yen
JIMMY YEN
Legal Assistant
EEOC Seattle Field Office
909 First Avenue, Suite 400
Seattle, WA 98104-1061
Telephone: 206-576-3043
Email: jimmy.yen@eeoc.gov

EEOC v. MONSON FRUIT CO. COMPLAINT Page 10 of 10

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION Seattle Field Office 909 First Avenue, Suite 400 Seattle, Washington 98104-1061 Telephone: (206) 220-6883 Facsimile: (206) 220-6911 TDD: (206) 220-6882